The Clear Evidences

for Demolishing the Idol of Democracy

100 Proofs for the Invalidity of Elections
and the Kufr of Parliaments

Ibn Almadi

1446 AH
2025 CE

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

Definition of Democracy.....3

The Evidences Demonstrating the Kufr of Democracy.....4

-Section: On Legislation.....4

-Section: On Rulership (Al-Hukm).....8

Section addressing some of the doubts.....15

Doubt: Participation in elections as the lesser of two evils or to minimize harm.....15

Doubt: Comparing Participation in Elections to Eating Pork Out of Necessity.....18

Doubt: "Kufr less than Kufr".....25

Doubt: Prophet Yusuf, participating in the government of the king of Egypt who ruled by other than what Allah revealed.....31

Doubt: Al-Najashi and His Ruling by Other Than What Allah Revealed.....39

Doubt: Du'a of the Sahabah for al-Najashi for victory over his enemy.....45

A Final Advice.....49

Lastly: Do not blindly follow anyone.....50

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Foreword:

Praise be to Allah, the One who honors those who obey Him and humiliates those who disobey Him. All praise is due to Allah who has completed the religion for us and has made, in every era, a group that remains manifest upon the truth, unharmed by those who forsake or oppose them.

May peace and blessings be upon the one who was sent with the message of monotheism — our Prophet Muhammad ﷺ — who conveyed the message, fulfilled the trust, and left his nation upon a clear path, whose night is as bright as its day; none deviates from it after him except one who is doomed.

To proceed:

> Legislation is the exclusive right of Allah alone, and ruling is an act of worship. Participation in legislative councils is major shirk, and likewise, appointing them (those who legislate besides Allah).

Introduction:

One of the greatest tribulations facing the Muslim Ummah in our time is the prevalence of trials and the embellishment of falsehood in the guise of truth, to the extent that concepts have become confused, and few are those who weigh matters with the scale of Tawheed and the Sunnah. Among the most dangerous of these trials is the trial of “democracy” and its consequences — such as participation in elections for legislative councils — wherein attributes exclusive to the Lordship of Allah, such as ruling and legislating, are attributed to human beings.

Many people have either neglected or deliberately overlooked the fact that participating in these councils is not just a simple mistake or sin. In reality, it is major shirk that takes a person out of the fold of Islam. This is because it involves competing with Allah over one of His greatest and most exclusive rights: legislation. It also involves directing the act of ruling and judgment to others besides Him, which is a form of worship.

The role of parliaments today in all democratic systems is to make laws based on the opinion of the majority, without regard for the law of Allah. The elected representative legislates without Allah, and whoever votes for him has delegated and empowered him, becoming a partner in this act. According to the **Fiqh principle:** "The one who causes an action is judged like the one who does it, if he shares in the act. The supporter is judged like the doer," so the voter becomes a partner in appointing those who declare what is forbidden to be lawful, and what is lawful to be forbidden—thus taking them as lords besides Allah, whether knowingly or unknowingly.

Because of the seriousness of this matter, I felt it necessary to present this brief book to clarify the truth and refute the doubts of those who permit democratic elections. It is based on the Qur'an, Sunnah, the understanding of the righteous predecessors, and the statements of reliable scholars—especially contemporary ones whose words are recognized even by our opponents.

Based on this, dear Muslim brother, I present to you this clarification — asking Allah to make this work sincere for His sake and beneficial to His servants. Whatever is correct is from Allah, and any error is from myself and Shaytaan. Please remember me in your sincere du'a.

Your brother,
The servant in need of his Lord's forgiveness — Ibn Almadi.

Definition of Democracy

Linguistic Definition:

The word *democracy* (from the Greek *demokratia*) is made up of two parts: *demos*, meaning "the people," and *kratein*, meaning "to rule." Thus, in its linguistic sense, democracy means "rule of the people" or "rule by the majority."

Terminological Definition:

democracy is a system that originated from a nation (the Greeks) that did not acknowledge divine laws or believe in revelation. It is based on the idea that legislation and authority come from humans alone, with no role for divine guidance or a ruling deity.

Those who think democracy is merely a method for choosing a ruler misunderstand it completely. It is, in fact, a full system of governance where people legislate for themselves, independent of divine laws. It also promotes four core freedoms: freedom of thought, belief, practice, and religion—freedoms that Islam fundamentally rejects. Believing in or adopting these principles is considered disbelief (kufr) that takes one outside the fold of Islam, as Islam is based on submission to Allah's commands and not the desires or opinions of people.

And calling democracy "voting" does not change their true nature, for what matters are the realities and meanings, not the names and appearances. This is merely one of the tricks of Shaytaan, making forbidden falsehood appear as acceptable truth. A similar example was mentioned by **Ibn al-Qayyim رحمه الله, who said:** "Among the types of shirk is the disciple prostrating to his sheikh. This is shirk both from the one prostrating and the one being prostrated to. **What is astonishing is that they claim it's not actual prostration, but only placing the head before the sheikh out of respect and humility.** It should be said to such people: no matter what you choose to call it, the reality of prostration is placing the head before the one it is done to — whether it be an idol, the sun, a star, or a stone."(Madarij al-Salikin, 2/925)

Likewise, it should be said to the advocates of democracy: no matter what name you give to elections, their reality is the selection of lawmakers besides Allah, based on man-made constitutions.

Shaykh Muhammad al-Amin al-Shanqiti said, in his commentary on verses [114–117] of Surah Al-An'am:

"These verses, and others with a similar meaning, clearly invalidate the type of rule that deceives people and is called 'democracy,' as it is the rule of the misguided majority — the rule of the masses and the mob." (*Hukm al-Jahiliyyah*, p.[30])

The Evidences Demonstrating the Kufr of Democracy

-Section: On Legislation

First: In **democracy**, legislation is considered the right of parliamentarians or lawmakers who are appointed by voters.

In Islam, however, legislation is the exclusive right of Allah — no one is allowed to share in it.

Legislation is an active attribute affirmed for Allah in the Qur'an and Sunnah, and it is one of the distinct characteristics of His Lordship (Rububiyyah). Whoever disputes with Him in this matter has committed disbelief (kufr), and whoever appoints someone to share in this right is judged accordingly. Allah alone is Ash-Shāri' (the Law-Giver), and Al-Musharri' (the Legislator) — though these are not among His Names, they describe His actions. **Proof from the Qur'an:** "He has legislated for you of religion what He enjoined upon Noah and that which We have revealed to you..." (Ash-Shura, 42:13)

Allah the Exalted says: {Or do they have partners who have legislated for them from the religion that which Allah has not permitted?} (Surah Ash-Shura, 42:21)

Al-Sa'di said in his tafsir (exegesis):

"Allah informs us that the polytheists took partners—those they allied with and joined in disbelief and its actions—among the devils of mankind who call to disbelief. *'They legislated for them from the religion that which Allah had not permitted'*—including acts of shirk, innovations, prohibiting what Allah has made lawful, and permitting what He has forbidden, based on their desires. Yet religion must only consist of what Allah legislates, so that the servants may follow it and draw closer to Him."

Ibn Kathir said:

"That is, they do not follow what Allah has legislated for you from the upright religion, but instead follow what their devils among jinn and mankind have legislated—such as prohibiting what they made unlawful for themselves (like the bahirah, sa'ibah, wasilah, and hām), permitting carrion, blood, and gambling, and other such misguided and ignorant practices they invented during the time of Jahiliyyah, including invalid forms of worship and corrupt statements." (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, 6/545*)

Al-Qurtubi said:

"Do they have gods who legislated for them the shirk which Allah did not permit? Since this is impossible, it follows that Allah did not legislate shirk—so from where did they take it as their religion? This noble verse condemns their shirk in the strongest terms and rebukes their ignorance, as they committed shirk with Allah—exalted is He—without any proof or even the semblance of proof for the falsehood they followed." (*Tafsir al-Qurtubi, 16/19*)

I say: The words of Al-Qurtubi and the other scholars seem as though they are speaking directly about today's lawmakers and voters—those who have taken others as lords besides Allah and given them one of His exclusive rights "which is legislation".

Shaykh Muhammad al-Amin al-Shanqiti said: "It is clear that none besides Allah possesses the attributes of permitting or forbidding. Since legislation and all rulings—whether religious or universal—**are from the exclusive rights of Lordship**, as indicated by the aforementioned verses, then whoever follows a law other than the law of Allah **has taken that lawgiver as a lord** and has associated him with Allah." *(Adhwa' al-Bayan, 7/180)*

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "Permitting and forbidding belong only to Allah and His Messenger. So whoever punishes for doing or not doing something without the command of Allah and His Messenger, and makes this a law in the religion, has set up a rival to Allah and a counterpart to His Messenger—like the polytheists who set up partners with Allah, or like the Murtadeen who believed in Musaylimah the Liar, about whom it was said: {*Or do they have partners who have legislated for them from the religion that which Allah has not permitted*}." *(Al-Fatawa al-Kubra, 6/339)*

I say: Here, Ibn Taymiyyah clearly explains that declaring things lawful or unlawful is a right that belongs to Allah alone. Whoever legislates contrary to His Shari'ah has made himself a rival to Allah. It is as though he is speaking directly about today's lawmakers in parliaments—those who legislate according to their whims. And whoever votes for them in elections shares in their governance, for without the voter's, they would not have reached that position as legislators without Allah.

Shaykh Ibn ʿUthaymīn said: "Among the forms of shirk with Allah is associating others with Him in judgment—by believing that someone other than Allah has the right to legislate for the people laws to replace Allah's Shari'ah. As He, the Most High, said: {*They took their rabbis and monks as lords besides Allah, and also the Messiah, son of Mary, while they were commanded to worship only one God*} [al-Tawbah: 31]. They used to permit what Allah forbade and forbid what Allah permitted, and the people would follow them in that. Whoever legislates such laws has placed himself in the position of divinity or lordship—he has made himself a legislating lord. And whoever obeys him and agrees with him in that is a mushrik, for he has placed him in the role of a lord in legislation." *(Al-Sharḥ al-Mumtiʿ ʿalā Zād al-Mustaqniʿ, 14/409)*

Ibn ʿUthaymīn also said: "**Replacing the Shari'ah with man-made laws is Kufr**, because it entails removing Allah's law and putting taghūt (false gods) in its place. This falls under the saying of Allah:

{*And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers*} [Al-Mā'idah: 44]."(*Liqa' al-Bāb al-Maftūḥ, 33/9*)

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh said: "The one who legislates, and whoever obeys him in making the lawful unlawful and the unlawful lawful—contradicting the Shari'ah of Allah—**is a kafir**. And whoever obeys him in this has taken him as a lord besides Allah." *(Al-Tamhīd li-Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, p. 429)*

I say: This evidence of the disbelief inherent in elections, because the result of electing candidates is granting them the power to permit and forbid as they wish. This constitutes a direct challenge to Allah's exclusive right of legislation, and contradicts His law. It is therefore shirk in the realm of Lordship and Divinity.

Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān said: "Just as it is impermissible to obey scholars who declare the unlawful to be lawful and the lawful to be unlawful, it is likewise impermissible to obey rulers and leaders who judge among people by laws other than the Islamic Shari'ah. This is because judgment must be referred to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger in all disputes, conflicts, and aspects of life. This is the essence of servitude and monotheism (Tawḥīd), **for legislation is the sole right of Allah**, as He said: 'Unquestionably, to Him belongs the creation and the command'—meaning, judgment belongs to Him alone." *(Al-Irshād ilā Ṣaḥīḥ al-I'tiqād, p. 87)*

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Shinqīṭī said: "As for one who legislates laws permitting what Allah has forbidden and forbidding what He has permitted, his disbelief is major kufr. Through the divine texts we mentioned, it becomes absolutely clear that **those who follow man-made laws—legislated by Satan through his allies and contrary to what Allah revealed through His Messengers** (peace be upon them)—there is no doubt about their disbelief and polytheism, except for those whose insight Allah has blinded and whose hearts have been veiled from the light of revelation, just like them." *(Aḍwā' al-Bayān 4/83)*

Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān also said: “Referring to Allah’s law is not just for seeking justice, **but more importantly, it is an act of worship, a right due to Allah alone, and a matter of belief.** So whoever refers to anything other than Allah’s Shari‘ah from among man-made systems and laws has taken the makers and enforcers of those laws as partners with Allah in His right to legislate. Allah says: ‘Or do they have partners who have legislated for them in religion that which Allah has not permitted?’ and He also says: ‘If you obey them, indeed you are polytheists.” *(Al-Irshād ilā Ṣaḥīḥ al-I‘tiqād, p. 87)*

I say: His words here were about those who refer to these man-made laws for judgment—so what then can be said of those who, by their own free will, go and appoint these tyrannical lawmakers to legislate such laws?!

-Section: On Rulership (Al-Ḥukm)

First: Rulership is a form of worship, and it is not permissible to direct this act of worship to anyone other than Allah—it is like all other acts of worship.

In Islam, Allah says: *"Judgment belongs to none but Allah." [Yusuf 40]* But **in democracy,** rulership is assigned to *"the people or their representatives."*

Ruling by what Allah has revealed is part of the oneness of divinity **(Tawḥīd al-Ulūhiyyah)**. Allah is described as *Al-Ḥākim* and *Al-Ḥakam*—these are among His names, established in the Qur’an and Sunnah.

Evidence from the Qur’an:

1. *“He shares His rule with none.”* — [Al-Kahf: 26]
2. *“Shall I seek a judge other than Allah?”* — [Al-An‘ām: 114]
3. *“Be patient until Allah judges between us, for He is the best of judges.”* — [Al-A‘rāf: 87]

Al-Ḥakam* and *Al-Ḥākim both mean "the judge," but ***Al-Ḥakam*** is more emphatic, indicating the One to whom all judgment ultimately returns.

Allah the Exalted said: “Judgment belongs to none but Allah. He has commanded that you worship none but Him. That is the upright religion, but most of the people do not know.” [Yusuf: 40]

Al-Sa‘di said in his Tafsir on this verse: *"Because judgment is for Allah alone—He is the One who commands and forbids, legislates the laws, and enacts the rulings. And He is the One who has commanded you not to worship anyone except Him..."*

[Tafsir Al-Sa'di, p. 398]

Ibn Taymiyyah commented on this verse: "Rulership belongs to Allah alone, and His messengers convey His judgments. So their rulings are His rulings, their commands are His commands, and obedience to them is obedience to Him. Whatever the Messenger judges, commands, and legislates as part of the religion is obligatory upon all creation to follow and obey—for that is Allah's judgment upon His creation. The Messenger conveys on behalf of Allah... Therefore, all people must accept the judgment of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him). No one has the right to step outside of his ruling, whether they be scholars, kings, elders, or anyone else. If **Musa or 'Isa** (peace be upon them) were alive and present, they would be obligated to follow him." *[Majmoo' al-Fatāwā 35/363]*

I say: Where is the judgment belonging solely to Allah? Or the following of the Messenger ﷺ in democratic elections? Judgment and obedience have instead been handed over to elected representatives in parliaments, to legislate and rule without Allah.

Shaykh Hamoud bin 'Uqla al-Shu'aybi said: "Whoever rules by man-made laws and removes the Sharia is a kafir there is no doubt about his Kufr, based on the words of Allah, the words of His Messenger ﷺ, and the words of the righteous predecessors. Allah, the Exalted, sent His Messenger ﷺ with a mission, **the first** and most important of which is the call to worship Him alone and abandon associating partners with Him. **Secondly**, the call to His law, to uphold it, and to judge according to it. So whoever worships others along with Him is a Mushrik in worship, **and whoever judges by other than His law is a Mushrik in judgment.** Allah says: {*And He allows no one to share in His judgment*} [Al-Kahf: 26], which is a clear and explicit text. And He also says: {Judgment belongs only to Allah. He has commanded that you worship none but Him. That is the upright religion, but most people do not know} [Yusuf: 40]." *[Collected Works of Shaykh al-Shu'aybi, p. 30]*

I say: It is clear from this verse that ruling is an act of worship that must be directed to Allah alone, as He has linked judgment with worship. So whoever associates someone else in Allah's judgment—such as legislators in parliaments—is no different than one who associates others in worship. It is like someone who prays and prostrates to an idol. This is disbelief, for in both cases worship has been directed to other than Allah.

Shaykh Muhammad al-Amin al-Shanqiti said: "Know, O brothers, that associating partners with Allah in His judgment and associating partners with Him in worship are one and the same—there is absolutely no difference between them. **Whoever follows a system other than Allah's system, or legislation other than Allah's legislation**—or contrary to what Allah has legislated—a law devised by humans, turning away from the light of the heavens which Allah revealed through His Messenger… **such a person is no different at all from one who worships idols and prostrates to statues. They are one and the same. Both are associating partners with Allah—one in worship and the other in judgment. They are equal.**" *[Adhwa' al-Bayan 7/162]*

Allah the Exalted said: {Do they seek the judgment of [the days of] ignorance? And who is better than Allah in judgment for a people who are certain [in faith]} *[Surah Al-Ma'idah: 50]*

Ibn Kathir said in his Tafsir on this verse: *"*Allah condemns those who turn away from His definitive ruling, which encompasses all that is good and forbids all that is evil, and instead turn to opinions, desires, and conventions invented by men without any reference to Allah's Sharia. This is like what the people of ignorance used to judge by—misguidance and falsehoods they invented based on their own opinions and whims. Similarly, the **Tatars ruled** by royal policies derived from their king **[Genghis Khan]**, who compiled for them a book called '**Yassa**,' which was a collection of laws taken from various sources—Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and others—and many rulings were based purely on his own opinion and desire. This **'Yassa'** then became a followed legislation among his descendants, which they gave precedence over the ruling of the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. **Whoever among them does that is a Kafir.***"* *[Tafsir Ibn Kathir, 3/416]*

Shaykh Ibn 'Uthaymeen said: "Ruling by what Allah has revealed is part of the oneness of Lordship (Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyyah), because it is the implementation of Allah's judgment, which is a necessary consequence of His Lordship and His perfect dominion and authority. For this reason, Allah referred to those who are followed in opposition to what He has revealed as **'lords'** over their **followers**, saying: {*They took their rabbis and monks as lords besides Allah...*} [At-Tawbah: 31] —meaning **they made them lawgivers alongside Allah**. And He

referred to the **followers as 'worshippers,'** because they humbled themselves to them and **obeyed them in contradicting the rulings of Allah**. '**Adiyy ibn Ḥātim** said to the **Messenger of Allah ﷺ:** 'But they did not worship them.' So the Prophet ﷺ replied: 'Yes, they made lawful for them what Allah had made unlawful, and made unlawful what Allah had made lawful, and they followed them; that is their worship of them.'" *[Majmū' Fatāwā wa Rasā'il Ibn 'Uthaymeen, 2/140]*

I say: The Shaykh's words here are explicit and contain definitive evidence of the Kufr of both the lawmakers and their voters—because they made them lords besides Allah and directed worship to them. This is clear and unambiguous proof, not from the allegorical, nor something open to interpretation, nor something irrelevant to the issue—unlike the so-called evidence used by those who permit elections.

Shaykh Ahmad Shākir said: "The matter of these man-made laws is as clear as the sun: it is blatant kufr without any ambiguity or concealment. There is no excuse for anyone who affiliates himself with Islam—whoever he may be—to implement them, submit to them, or approve of them—let alone to legislate them or to swear an oath to uphold them. So let every person beware for his own sake, and every soul is accountable for itself. Let the scholars speak the truth openly, without fear, and deliver what they are commanded to deliver without hesitation or negligence." *[Umdat al-Tafsīr, 4/174]*

I say: What is the role of a member in these idolatrous, polytheistic assemblies other than drafting and legislating laws of kufr? And what is your role, O voter, except appointing him to carry out this act of kufr on your behalf? Even if you claim otherwise, this is the bitter truth. Even if you detest these laws, the candidate to whom you gave your vote will still take the parliamentary oath to uphold the constitution and legislate according to it.

Allah the Exalted said: {And He makes none to share in His decision and His rule}، There is also a different recitation by Ibn ʻĀmir: {And do not associate anyone in His judgment}، in the imperative form (as a prohibition).

Al-Ṭabarī commented in his Tafsīr: "He (Allah) does not make anyone a partner in His decision and judgment concerning His creation. Rather, He alone is the One who judges, decrees, manages, and disposes of their affairs as He wills and loves." *[Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī, 17/650]*

Ibn Kathīr said in his Tafsīr: "This means that He alone has the creation and the command; none can overturn His judgment. He has no minister, supporter, partner, or advisor. Exalted and sanctified is He." *[Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr, 5/151]*

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Amīn al-Shanqīṭī said: *"The ruling of Allah – the Exalted – mentioned in His statement: {And He does not share His judgment with anyone}* includes everything that He decrees, and foremost among these is legislation..." Until he said: "Indeed, those who follow man-made laws legislated by Satan upon the tongues of his allies, in opposition to what Allah – the Exalted – has legislated upon the tongues of His Messengers (peace be upon them), there is no doubt about their Kufr and Shirk – except for one whose insight Allah has blinded and whose heart has been veiled from the light of revelation, just like them." *[Adhwaa' al-Bayaan, 7/162]*

Hamad ibn Farris Al-Najdi said: "The second fundamental principle: Allah's statement: {*So the judgment is only for Allah*} [Ghafir, 40:12] – meaning that the decreed, universal, and legislative rulings belong solely to Him. That is, none judges, legislates, or decrees except Him. {The Most High, The Most Great} [Surah Ghafir, 40:12]." *[Al-Durar al-Saniyyah fi al-Ajwibah al-Najdiyyah, 12/491]*

Salih al-Fawzan said: "Ruling by man-made laws is ruling by a Taghut (false deity), and Allah has commanded disbelief in the Taghut, and made disbelief in the Taghut a pillar of Tawheed; as He said: {*So whoever disbelieves in the Taghut and believes in Allah has grasped the most trustworthy handhold*} [Al-Baqarah , 2:256].

Whoever rules by man-made laws is not a true monotheist, for he has taken a partner with Allah in legislation and obedience. He has not disbelieved in the Taghut as he was commanded to do, and he has obeyed Satan – as Allah said: {*And Satan only wishes to lead them far astray*} [An-Nisa, 4:60] " *[Al-Irshad ila Sahih al-I'tiqad, p. 88]*

Shaykh Abdul Aziz al-Nasir al-Rasheed said: "Allah's statement: {*Indeed, Allah rules as He wills*} [Al-Maaid, 5:1] – meaning, He legislates what He wills in matters of lawful and unlawful, and there is no objection to His judgment. He is the **sole Ruler**, the All-Wise, and there is no judge besides Him. Every judgment apart from His is false and rejected, and every ruler who does not judge by His rule and that of His Messenger **is a Taghut and a kafir in Allah.**

Allah said: {*And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed – then they are the disbelievers*} [Al-Maaid, 5:44] This is a general statement encompassing everything. There is no issue except that Allah has provided a ruling concerning it: {*We have not neglected in the Book a thing*} [Al-An'am, 6:38].

There is no doubt that whoever turns away from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger and **substitutes them with man-made laws is a kafir in Allah**" *[Al-Tanbihat al-Saniyyah 'ala al-'Aqidah al-Wasitiyyah, p. 66]*

Shaykh Ibn ‘Uthaymeen said: "The Taghūt is anything that contradicts the judgment of Allah and His Messenger ﷺ, because anything that contradicts the ruling of Allah and His Messenger is tyranny and an encroachment upon the right of the One who has absolute authority and to whom all matters return — **and that is Allah**. Allah the Exalted said: {*Unquestionably, His is the creation and the command; blessed is Allah, Lord of the worlds*}[Al-A'raf, 7:54]." *[Majmū‘ Fatāwā wa Rasā’il Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, 1/39]*

I say: As is well known, members of parliaments legislate rulings that contradict the Law of the Most Merciful, and by doing so they become Taghūts because they compete with Allah in legislation and judgment. And if it were not for the voters, these Taghūts, who oppose Allah, would not exist. So do not be a partner in appointing a deity besides Allah on earth!

Shaykh Muhammad Hāmid al-Fiqī said: "Equal to this — or even worse — is the one who adopts the laws of the Westerners and uses them as a basis for judgment in matters of blood, private parts, and wealth, giving precedence to them over what he has come to know and what has become clear to him from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ. Without a doubt, **such a person is a kafir and an Murtad** if he persists in this and does not return to ruling by what Allah has revealed. No name he may take, **nor any apparent act of prayer or fasting, will benefit him.**" [Commentary on Fatḥ al-Majīd, p. 396]

I say: This ruling — and all similar rulings — applies to anyone who legislates man-made laws, seeks judgment by them, or acts upon them; his ruling is **kufr**. **Then I say:** What about the one who appoints these lawmaking ṭāghūts? Without a doubt, his ruling is the same as theirs. For by casting your vote into the ballot box, you have granted the candidate the authority to legislate laws. In doing so, you have fully consented to the rulings that the candidate will enact, whether you are pleased with them or not, as you have placed him, through your vote, in the position of the Creator. And the one who assists a deed is given the same ruling as the one who directly commits it. And Allah’s help is sought.

- section addressing some of the doubts raised by those who permit elections and the refutation of them:

The Doubt: Participating in elections is justified on the grounds of choosing the lesser of two evils, minimizing harm, or achieving benefit

First, we must explain this Fiqh principle to properly understand the issue. The implication of this principle is that if one is forced to commit one of two harms, it is permissible to commit the lesser of the two to avoid the greater. However, it is not permissible to commit the greater harm to avoid the lesser.

For this reason, the five necessities that the religion came to preserve—namely: **religion**, **life**, **intellect**, **honor**, and **wealth**—are arranged in this specific order As stated by **Al-Shatibi** regarding the consensus in *[Al-Muwafaqat 1/31]*. So, when necessity calls for the choice between two harms, the lesser harm is to be chosen.

Ibn Amir Al-Hajj said: "(The preservation of religion) among the necessities takes precedence over the others in cases of conflict because it is the greatest objective. Allah says: { *And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me* } [Adh-Dhariyat: 56]." *[Al-Taqrir wal-Tahbir 3/231]*

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said: "It is not permissible to repel lesser corruption by committing greater corruption, nor to avert the lesser of two harms by bringing about the greater of them. The Shariah came to attain benefits and complete them, and to prevent harms and minimize them as much as possible. Its goal is to prefer the greater of two goods if they cannot be combined, and to avert the worse of two evils if both cannot be avoided." *[Majmoo' al-Fatawa, 23/343]*

Based on this Fiqh principle, democrats have claimed that entering elections and parliaments is permissible under the pretext of reducing harm upon Muslims and bringing about certain benefits—such as lessening hostility and oppression against them, preventing the closure of mosques and Islamic schools, and avoiding bans on the hijab and similar matters. Some even claim that participation in elections is obligatory, and that abstaining from voting is sinful, arguing that abstention could enable extremist racist parties that may work to expel Muslims from these lands.

I say: There is an important matter that must be remembered: Rulership (ḥukm) is an act of worship and must not be directed to other than Allah. It is like all other acts of worship. Likewise, legislation is a sole and absolute right of Allah and one of the exclusive attributes of His Lordship. No one is allowed to dispute Him in this right, and none of it may be directed to anyone besides Him, as the evidences I have cited earlier indicate.

Therefore, affirming the exclusivity of Allah in legislation and judgment falls under the categories of **Tawheed al-Ruboobiyyah** (Oneness of Lordship) and **Tawheed al-Uloohiyyah** (Oneness of Worship). It is a matter of Tawheed, and whoever nullifies it commits **kufr**.

Based on the same legal maxim that they cite, **I say:** this principle is an argument against them, not for them. It is well known that the greatest form of evil, harm, and injustice on earth is shirk, as **Allah says:** {*Indeed, shirk is a great injustice*} [Luqman: 13]

The harm of closing mosques, Islamic schools, banning the hijab, and all similar arguments they bring forth are lesser **than the harm of shirk**—specifically, directing the judgment and legislation to other than Allah. In fact, I go further and say that **even killing is a lesser harm than shirk.** The proof is in the verse: *{And fitnah is worse than killing}* [Al-Baqarah: 191] According to the majority of the Companions, the Tābiʿīn, and scholars of tafsīr, the word fitnah here refers to shirk. Among them are: **Al-Hasan, Mujahid, Saʿid ibn Jubayr, ʿIkrimah, Abu al-ʿĀliyah, Qatādah, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, and al-Rabīʿ ibn Anas.**

Ibn Taymiyyah said, while discussing the principle of choosing the lesser of two harms and after mentioning some examples:

> "Just as the killing of a person may be preferred over committing disbelief, as Allah says: *'And fitnah (trial/disbelief) is worse than killing'* [Al-Baqarah: 191] — souls that cause fitnah against faith may be killed, because the harm of disbelief is greater than the harm of killing a soul. Similarly, the hand of the thief is cut, the adulterer is stoned, and the drinker is flogged despite the harm in these punishments, because they are necessary to repel the greater harm of the crimes themselves. These prescribed punishments — though harmful in essence — have been commanded because they prevent greater harm, as there is no way to eliminate that greater corruption except through this lesser one." [*Majmoo' al-Fataawa* 20/52]

Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman said:

> "If you know that referring judgment to the tāghūt is kufr, then Allah has mentioned in His Book that Al-kufr is greater than killing. He said: *'And fitnah is worse than killing'* and *'Fitnah is more severe than killing'* [Al-Baqarah: 191, 217]. The 'fitnah' here means Al-kufr. So, if the desert dwellers and the townspeople were to fight each other to the point of destruction, that would still be lighter than appointing a tāghūt on earth who rules contrary to the Shariah of Islam, which Allah sent His Messenger (peace be upon him) with." [*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah* 10/510]

As for the one who says: *"Our only goal in participating in elections is to achieve some benefit,"* we say: What kind of benefit is it that leads one into shirk — by directing the act of *legislation* (which is worship) to someone other than Allah and by appointing law-makers who share with Him in His exclusive right?

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> "Indeed, shirk, speaking about Allah without knowledge, immoralities both apparent and hidden, and injustice — none of these contain any kind of benefit whatsoever… Therefore, making the religion purely for Allah and establishing justice is an absolute obligation in every situation and under every law." [*Majmoo' al-Fataawa* 14/476]

I say: Based on the correct application of this jurisprudential principle, it is not permissible for a Muslim to participate in elections to appoint tāghūts who contend with Allah in His rule and legislation, under any pretense. Shirk is the greatest of injustices — there is no wrongdoing above it. And if we face restrictions in any land we live in, then it becomes obligatory for us to migrate from that land to preserve our religion. We are not allowed to compromise or abandon any part of it — not for the sake of securing worldly interests or preventing harms — because **there is no benefit in shirk**.

The Doubt: Comparing Participation in Elections to Eating Pork Out of Necessity

This *shubhah* (misconception) arises from a misunderstanding of the fiqh of necessity and a confusion between **compulsion (ikrāh mulji' – absolute coercion)** and **necessity (ḍarūrah)**. It is well-known that there is a significant difference between the two. Based on this misunderstanding, some people apply a false analogy and claim that participation in democratic elections is like eating pork in cases of necessity. But we ask: **Does necessity permit committing shirk?!**

First: The Meaning of "Necessity" Linguistically and Technically

- **Linguistically**: It comes from "iḍṭirār," meaning "need for something." *"iḍṭarrahu"* means: "He compelled him to it, and there was no avoiding it."
  [Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, 4/483–484]
- **Technically (in Islamic legal terminology)**:
  Abū Bakr al-Jaṣṣāṣ said:
  "It is the fear of harm or destruction to the soul or part of the body due to abstaining from food."
  [*Aḥkām al-Qurʾān*, 1/195]

Evidences from the Qur'an:

Allah says:

> *"Prohibited to you are dead animals, blood, the flesh of swine, and that which has been dedicated to other than Allah, and [those animals] killed by strangling, or by a violent blow, or by falling, or by the goring of horns, and those from which a wild animal has eaten—except what you are able to slaughter [before death]—and those that are sacrificed on stone altars, and [prohibited] is to divide meat with arrows—that is grave disobedience. This day those who disbelieve have despaired of [defeating] your religion; so fear them not, but fear Me. This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as your religion. But whoever is forced by extreme hunger with no inclination to sin—then indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful."* [Al-Mā'idah 5:3]

Tafsīr of *"Whoever is forced by extreme hunger"*:

- **Al-Ṭabarī**, from Ibn ʿAbbās: *"Whoever is compelled by extreme hunger (mukhmaṣah) means by starvation."*
  And from Qatādah: *"In a state of hunger."*
- **al-Baghawī**: *"That he is exhausted by hunger; mukhmaṣah means an empty belly due to lack of food. One says: 'a man with a hungry stomach (khamīṣ al-baṭn).'"*
- **Ibn Kathīr**: *"Whoever is compelled by necessity to consume something from these prohibited things mentioned, he may consume it."*
- **al-Saʿdī**: *"He is driven by necessity to eat from the previously mentioned prohibitions—that is, during starvation."*

Allah also says:

> *"He has only forbidden to you dead animals, blood, the flesh of swine, and that which has been dedicated to other than Allah. But whoever is compelled [by necessity]—neither desiring it nor transgressing—there is no sin upon him. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful."* [Al-Baqarah 2:173]

Tafsīr on This Verse:

- **Al-Ṭabarī**: *"Whoever is compelled by necessity of starvation to eat from the forbidden items mentioned, in the manner we have described, then there is no sin upon him."*
- **Al-Baghawī**: *"The meaning is: whoever is forced to eat dead meat, that is, someone who is in need and has been driven to it."*
- **Ibn Kathīr**: *"Likewise, pork is forbidden, whether it died naturally or otherwise. Then Allah permits its consumption when there is dire necessity and no other food is available."*

Thus, it is understood from these verses and the scholars' interpretations that they pertain to alleviating hunger by consuming prohibited items, and they have nothing to do with shirk

And Here I Ask Again: Does Necessity Permit Shirk or the Kufr?

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah answers:

> "The prohibited matters are of two categories:
> **(1)** That which is never permissible under any circumstance—such as *shirk* (associating partners with Allah), *fawāḥish* (immoralities), speaking about Allah without knowledge, and pure oppression. These are the four mentioned in **His saying:**
> *'Say: My Lord has only forbidden immoralities—what is apparent of them and what is concealed—and sin, and oppression without right, and that you associate with Allah that for which He has sent down no authority, and that you say about Allah what you do not know.'* [Al-Aʿrāf 7:33]
> These are prohibited in all divine laws, and Allah sent all the messengers forbidding them. None of these have *ever* been permitted—under *any* circumstance.
> Hence, they were revealed in this Makkan sūrah, where prohibition of other things was not yet in effect. What was prohibited after them—such as blood, carrion, and pork—was only forbidden under some conditions, not in an absolute sense.
> For example, **wine** is permitted (by agreement) to clear food stuck in the throat, and it is permitted to quench thirst according to one opinion. Those who disallow it say: 'It does not actually quench thirst,' which is the reasoning of Imam Aḥmad.

> Similarly, pork is allowed to stave off starvation. But the necessity of thirst—which some consider more dangerous than hunger—makes it permissible to drink impure substances (najāsāt) in such cases, without any dispute. However, if the thirst is not relieved, then there is **no** permissibility at all." [Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā, 14/470]

I Say: Shaykh al-Islām clearly shows that **necessity does not permit shirk or kufr under any condition**. Necessity only makes exceptions regarding food or drink in cases of life-threatening situations.

Statements of Other Scholars:

- **Shaykh Ḥamad ibn ʿAtīq**, responding to those who equated necessity with coercion in the matter of kufr:

> *"**Allah says:** (But whoever is forced by necessity—without willful disobedience or transgressing—there is no sin upon him.)* [al-Baqarah 2:173]
> So, even after the presence of harm, the condition is that the person is neither willful nor exceeding limits. The difference between necessity and coercion is obvious.
> **We also ask:** Does the permission to eat dead meat under necessity indicate that apostasy is allowed by choice?"

- **Shaykh ʿAlī al-Khuḍayr**, commenting on this:

> "This is the key point and the refutation of their claim.
> How can one use the permissibility of eating carrion during necessity as evidence for the permissibility of apostasy by choice?!
> **This is impermissible, because apostasy is not allowed even under necessity.**
> Eating carrion is allowed in dire necessity—but apostasy, disbelief, and shirk are **never** permissible—neither due to necessity nor for daʿwah interests." [Audio: "Does necessity or benefit permit shirk or kufr?"]

- **al-Zarkashī** said:

> *"Necessities make prohibitions permissible."*
> Thus, carrion is allowed during starvation, swallowing food with wine when choking, and saying the word of Al-kufr **under compulsion**. [*al-Manthūr fī al-Qawāʿid*, 2/317]

Conclusion:

Necessities permit *some* prohibitions—like eating or drinking forbidden items—when one fears for his life from death. **However, they do not permit kufr or shirk**, *except* in the case of **absolute compulsion (ikrāh mulji')**.

Complete Coercion (al-Ikrāh al-Tām) – In Summary

Allah said:

> *"Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief—except for one who is forced while his heart is content with faith…"* [al-Naḥl 16:106]

- **Ibn ʿAbbās** said:

> "This verse was revealed concerning ʿAmmār ibn Yāsir when the polytheists tortured him until he verbally disbelieved in Muhammad ﷺ, agreeing with them under duress. He later came to the Prophet ﷺ seeking forgiveness, and Allah revealed this verse."
> Likewise reported by **al-Shaʿbī**, **Abū Mālik**, and **Qatādah**. [Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr]

- **Ibn Qudāmah** said:

> "A person is not considered coerced unless he experiences actual harm—such as beating, strangulation, squeezing of the legs, and similar acts. Mere threats do **not** constitute coercion.
> **But if he is actually harmed—through beating, strangling, pressure, imprisonment, or waterboarding along with threats—then this is unquestionably coercion.**
> It was narrated that the polytheists seized ʿ**Ammār** and forced him to commit **shirk**, and he complied. The Prophet ﷺ met him while he was weeping and wiped his tears, saying:
> *'The polytheists took you, dunked you in water, and ordered you to commit shirk—and you did. If they take you again, do the same.'* This was narrated by Abū Ḥafṣ with his chain.
> ʿ**Umar** (may Allah be pleased with him) **said:**
> *'A man is not accountable for himself if he is starving, beaten, or bound.'*
> This indicates that a tangible act must exist for coercion to apply.
> As for threats alone, there are two narrations from **Aḥmad**:
>
> - One view: **It is not coercion**, because the concession in the case of ʿAmmār involved **actual** harm: *'They dunked you in water'*—so the same rule only applies to similar cases.
> - The second view: **Mere threats** can be considered coercion.
>
> **Ibn Manṣūr** narrated: *"The threshold for coercion is the fear of being killed or severely beaten."*
>
> This is the view of most jurists, including **Abū Ḥanīfah** and **al-Shāfiʿī.**" [Al-Mughnī, 10/352]

Therefore, Coercion That Excuses a Person Includes:

- Danger to life
- Risk of losing a limb or vital organ
- Severe physical beating
- Imprisonment that may lead to death or severe harm

I Say:

The difference between **necessity** and **coercion** should now be clear.
Whoever is not subjected to any of the above is not truly coerced and thus **is not excused** for falling into *shirk* or *kufr*.

Conclusion:

After clarifying the **fiqh of necessity** and distinguishing it from **coercion**, how can anyone possibly use the verse about *necessity*—which was revealed regarding **food and drink during starvation**—as proof for committing **shirk or Kufr**?
The essential difference in this issue is that those participating in **shirk-based elections** are doing so **willingly**, **not under coercion**, choosing to appoint law-makers (false lords) alongside Allah—all under the claim of **necessity**! And even if these people abstained from participating in these *shirk-based* elections — **Would they perish**, like one who is forced to eat carrion or pork? **Certainly not.**
This is a **false and invalid analogy.** Rather, it is **whims and worldly desires**, and a hatred of abandoning material comfort, that push them toward such **corrupt comparisons**.
And if they are truthful in their claim that they are being restricted in practicing their religion, then the **obligation upon them** is to **migrate** from the land in which they cannot establish their religion, rather than **compromising their tawḥīd** for the sake of worldly gain.

The Doubt: "Kufr less than Kufr"

This is among the most frequently cited doubts used by some to defend individuals who fall into nullifiers of *tawḥīd*. According to the proponents of this doubt, whoever commits shirk with Allah—such as directing acts of worship like ruling or legislating to other than Allah, altering the divine law, or appointing and upholding the system of a *ṭāghūt*—**should not be declared a disbeliever** so long as he possesses the "foundation of faith," i.e., inner belief, unless he explicitly declares *ḥalāl* (permissibility) in his heart or on his tongue.

In doing so, often unknowingly, they imitate the **Jahmiyyah sect** in their doctrine of *īmān*, who restricted faith to mere knowledge or internal affirmation—excluding action from its definition. And all this is based on a misinterpretation of the narration attributed to Ibn ʿAbbās (may Allah be pleased with him): *"Kufr below kufr"*. They have wrongly applied this to issues of *tawḥīd* and the fundamentals of religion (*uṣūl al-dīn*), even though its context is clearly related to *subsidiary matters* (*furūʿ*) and **practical sins**, not the major nullifiers of Islam.

So they misapplied the narration and argued with it in a place where it does not apply, and thus they went astray and led others astray.

The Narration:

> "From Hishām ibn Ḥujayr, from Ṭāwūs, who said: Ibn ʿAbbās said, 'It is not the kufr that you think it is. It is not kufr that expels one from the religion.' Then he recited: {*And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers*} [al-Mā'idah: 44]. It is kufr below kufr."
> [al-Sunan al-Kubrā by al-Bayhaqī 8/38], [al-Mustadrak 2/342]

I Say:

To begin with: the narration attributed to Ibn ʿAbbās—*"kufr below kufr"*—**is not authentically established from him**. It was reported **only** through **Hishām ibn Ḥujayr**, whose reliability is disputed and who has been **weakened** by a number of prominent ḥadīth scholars, including:

- **Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal** and **Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn**:

> **ʿAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad said:** "I asked my father about him, and he replied: 'He is not strong.' I asked: 'Is he weak?' He said: 'He's not quite that, but not reliable.'
> And I asked **Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn**, and he severely weakened him."
> [Tahdhīb al-Kamāl 30/179], [al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍuʿafāʾ, p. 784]

- **Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān** and **ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī**:

> **ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī said:** "I read to Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd a report: 'Ibn Jurayj narrated to us from **Hishām ibn Ḥujayr**.' **So Yaḥyā said:** 'It is best I abandon it.' I asked: 'Should I strike out his narrations?' He replied: 'Yes.'"
> [Tahdhīb al-Kamāl 30/179], [al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl 9/53]

- **ʿAmr ibn ʿAlī** said:

> "I heard Yaḥyā refuse to narrate from **Hishām ibn Ḥujayr** and not consider him reliable."
> [al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍuʿafāʾ 8/413]

- **Sufyān ibn ʿUyaynah**:

> **al-ʿUqaylī reported that Ibn ʿUyaynah said:** *"We did not take from him (Hishām) except what we could not find elsewhere."* [Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb 4/267]

Additionally, **Hishām** *was the only one to narrate this ḥadīth* (i.e., it is **mufrad** in chain), and beyond that, it **contradicts more authentic reports** from Ibn ʿAbbās himself.
For instance, **ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṭāwūs** reported from his father that:

> **Ibn ʿAbbās was asked about the verse:**
> *{And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers}*,
> and he replied: ***"It is kufr."***
> In another narration: ***"It is kufr in it"***
> In a third: ***"That is sufficient kufr."***
> [Narrated by ʿAbd al-Razzāq in his Tafsīr 1/191], [Ibn Jarīr 6/256], [Wakīʿ in *Akhbār al-Quḍāt* 1/41]

This is what is **authentically established** from Ibn ʿAbbās—he issued the ruling of *kufr* **without restriction**.

As for what was reported by **al-Ṭabarī** with a **sound isnād**:

> From Sufyān, from Maʿmar, from Ibn Ṭāwūs, from his father, from Ibn ʿAbbās:
> *"**It is kufr in it** —but not kufr in Allah, His angels, His books, or His messengers."*
> —this **final statement**: *"but not kufr in Allah…"* is the **comment of Ṭāwūs**, not of **Ibn ʿAbbās**.

Wakīʿ al-Qāḍī also reported:

> "**From al-Shaʿbī, from Ibn ʿAbbās:**
> *'No people ever ruled by other than what Allah revealed except that murder spread among them.'*
> And from al-Suddī who said: Ibn ʿAbbās said: *'Whoever judges unjustly while knowing, or rules without* knowledge, or takes a bribe in judgment—he is among **Al-kāfirīn.**' And this was concerning **the people of tawḥīd**." [Akhbār al-Quḍāt 1/41]

Again, Ibn ʿAbbās ruled *unrestrictedly here* with **Al-kufr**.

There is also a **principle** in interpretation:

> **Whenever the word "kufr" appears with the definite article (i.e., *al-kufr*), it refers to the greater kufr that expels from Islam.**

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him) said:

> "The unrestricted mention of kufr (al-kufr al-muṭlaq) refers to the major kufr that takes one out of the religion. So the general usage is directed toward it. … And defined disbelief refers to the well-known form of disbelief, which is that which expels one from the religion." [Sharḥ ʿUmdat al-Fiqh 2/76]

However, even if we assume the authenticity of the narration from Ibn ʿAbbās, its true import indicates that he was referring to a situation entirely different from what we are discussing today. **Ibn ʿAbbās was not speaking about someone who directed acts of worship to other than Allah, or someone who altered the law of Allah and replaced it with a different system of legislation, establishing it as a general law to be referred to in judgment and arbitration.**

Rather, his statement — *"Kufr dūna kufr"* (lesser disbelief), if authentically attributed to him — or similar phrases used by other scholars such as, *"Not disbelief in Allah, His angels, His books, and His messengers,"* or *"Not the disbelief you presume"* — was in response to the **Khawārij al-Ḥarūriyya**, who declared the Companions disbelievers due to sins and transgressions. The Khawārij cited the verse:

> **"And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed then it is those who are the disbelievers"** (al-Māʾidah: 44),

and took it in its absolute sense, thus declaring sinners — like the one who drinks alcohol, the thief, or the adulterer — to be disbelievers.

Likewise, they misinterpreted prophetic Ahadith such as: "Do not return to disbelief after me, striking the necks of one another," and "Insulting a Muslim is wickedness, and fighting him is disbelief," interpreting them to refer to major disbelief. Consequently, they declared the Companions who fought at al-Jamal and Ṣiffīn, and others who committed sins, to be disbelievers.

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> "They argued with the statement: 'Do not return after me as disbelievers, striking the necks of one another.' They said: Those who fought each other after him became disbelievers — and this and similar arguments were from the evidences used by the Khawārij."
>
> (*Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 7/260)

And Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Samʿānī stated:

> "You find the Khawārij using as evidence the Prophet's (peace be upon him) statement: 'Insulting a Muslim is wickedness, and fighting him is disbelief,' as well as his saying: 'The adulterer is not a believer while he is committing adultery, and the thief is not a believer while he is stealing.'"
> (*al-Intiṣār li-Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*, p. 36)

Based on this, the expressions "**Kufr dūna kufr**" "**wickedness less than wickedness**," and "**oppression less than oppression**" came to be understood as referring to sins which do not expel one from the religion. Thus, neither Ibn ʿAbbās nor the other early scholars were speaking about the modern forms of shirk, such as those who substitute Allah's law with man-made legislation and make it the general reference in governance, or those who associate others with Allah in the exclusive right of legislation, or who direct the act of judgment to others besides Him.
Moreover, during the time of Ibn ʿAbbās and the Salaf, no one had yet fallen into the kinds of modern scenarios we witness today — namely, ruling entirely by man-made secular laws and replacing the revealed law of Allah . Anyone who draws an analogy between that past context and our present reality has fallen into the deception of Iblīs.

The ḥadīth scholar Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir, commenting on the narration from Ibn ʿAbbās, *"Kufr dūna kufr"*, said:

> "These narrations from Ibn ʿAbbās and others are among those which the misguided of our era, both those claiming knowledge and those audacious against the religion, play games with: they use them as an excuse or justification **to permit the man-made pagan laws** that have been imposed upon the lands of Islam."
> (*ʿUmdat al-Tafsīr ʿan al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr*, vol. 1, p. 684)

And Shaykh Sulaymān ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb said

"As for your statement that al-Firyābī, Saʿīd ibn Manṣūr, Ibn al-Mundhir, and others narrated from Ibn ʿAbbās (may Allah be pleased with them both) in his commentary on the verse:

{And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed then they are the disbelievers} [al-Mā'idah: 44],

that it is not disbelief that expels one from the religion, but rather a 'disbelief lesser than disbelief' — and that 'Aṭā' said: 'disbelief lesser than disbelief (kufr dūna kufr), injustice lesser than injustice, and sin lesser than sin'

Then we say: The words of Ibn ʿAbbās (may Allah be pleased with them) are about one who judges by other than what Allah has revealed **in matters of secondary rulings** (furūʿ), while still affirming in his heart and declaring with his tongue that what he has turned away from is the judgment of Allah. As ʿ**Ikrimah said** in regard to the verse: {And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed then they are the disbelievers}: whoever knows in his heart that it is Allah's judgment but does not declare it with his tongue, and does not submit to it in his heart, rather denies it — then he has disbelieved with a disbelief that leaves no faith.

But the one who acknowledges in his heart and declares with his tongue that it is Allah's ruling, yet he errs and acts contrary **to it in matters of secondary jurisprudence not connected to core doctrine**, without making it permissible — then this is not real disbelief.

Then he said: To clarify the meaning of the verse: if ruling by other than what Allah revealed pertains **to the foundation of tawḥīd and abstaining from shirk**, or even to secondary rulings where one neither affirms it with the tongue nor submits in the heart — **then that is real Kufr**, as mentioned by ʿ**Ikrimah.**

However, whoever affirms Allah's judgment in his heart and declares it with his tongue, yet outwardly acts in contradiction to it **only in secondary matters, this is not Kufr** that expels from the religion.

Ṭāwūs said: 'This is not like one who disbelieves in Allah, His angels, His books, and His messengers.'

> And al-Thawrī narrated from Ibn Jurayj from **ʻAṭā' that he said:** 'This is disbelief lesser than disbelief, injustice lesser than injustice, and sin lesser than sin.' This was also narrated by Ibn Jarīr.
>
> And Wakīʿ narrated from Saʿīd al-Makkī **from Ṭāwūs:** '**Ruling in secondary matters** by other than what Allah revealed — while still affirming His judgment and loving it — **does not expel one from the religion.**'
>
> **The Khawārij** generalized the verse in its apparent wording and claimed it to be a clear text that whoever rules by other than what Allah revealed is a disbeliever, **and that every sinner has ruled by other than what Allah revealed, so he must be a Kafir.**
>
> However, there is a consensus among Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah opposing their view. We do not declare disbelief except upon those **who reject Allah's ruling in matters of tawḥīd, ruling by its opposite, committing shirk, and aligning with the people of shirk and supporting them against the people of tawḥīd.** (*al-Tawḍīḥ ʿan Tawḥīd al-Khallaq, p. 141*)

Doubt: Prophet Yusuf, peace be upon him, participating in the government of the king of Egypt who ruled by other than what Allah revealed

This is one of the most widespread doubts used by those who permit entering parliaments. They claim that the Prophet of Allah, Yusuf (peace be upon him), entered the government of a Taghut king and ruled by his laws!

Response:

---

1. First Issue: It has been said that the king during the time of Prophet Yusuf (peace be upon him) was a Muslim.

To clarify this, let's review the statements of scholars who said the king embraced Islam:

- **Imam al-Ṭabarī** quoted **Mujāhid** as saying: "The king who was with Yusuf embraced Islam." This was also the view of **Ibn Kathīr** in his Tafsīr.
- **Imam al-Baghawī** wrote: "Mujāhid and others said: Yusuf continued to gently call the king to Islam until the king and many of his people embraced Islam."

- **Al-Qurṭubī** said in his Tafsīr: "Pharaoh during Yusuf's time was righteous."
- **Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ḥanbalī al-Dimashqī** stated: "The king during Yusuf's time was al-Rayyān ibn al-Walīd, from the Amalekites, and he believed in Prophet Yusuf."
  This view was also adopted by **al-Naysābūrī**, **al-Māwardī (in "al-Nukat wa al-ʿUyūn")**, **al-Ālūsī**, **al-Zamakhsharī**, and **al-Rāzī** — and this is the view of a large group of scholars of Tafsir.

Hence, if we accept the view of these esteemed scholars, then this entire doubt collapses. There would be no valid basis to argue from this story that it is permissible to enter democratic elections or parliaments.
However, for the sake of argument, let's assume that the king was not a Muslim...

---

2. Even then, there are crucial differences between Prophet Yusuf (peace be upon him) and those who permit entering parliaments or elections.

First difference: The king **summoned Yusuf** because of his knowledge, excellence, and character. Allah says:

> "**And the king said: 'Bring him to me that I may select him exclusively for myself.**'" (Yusuf 12:54)
> **Meaning:** to make him part of his inner circle.

But you (parliamentarians) **run with your own feet** to join forces with the ṭāghūt systems and their rule. That alone is a fundamental difference. Entering parliament involves multiple acts of disbelief, and those who elect and appoint such members share in those deeds, as they support and empower them. **Among these acts of Kufrs:**

- **The first act of disbelief:** One must acknowledge the written constitution in force in the country. However, the Prophet of Allah Yusuf was not required to do this, nor did he do so.
- **The second act:** One must believe that the source of legislation is the lawmakers, and accept political, religious, or even atheistic pluralism. But Prophet Yusuf did none of this.
- **The third act:** One must believe in the principle of power rotation. Prophet Yusuf was not required to believe in or accept this.
- **The fourth act:** One must take an oath to respect the constitution and pledge not to support any laws that contradict the principles of the taghuti (tyrannical) constitution. But Prophet Yusuf was not required to do any of this.

Thus, it becomes clear that this analogy (between parliamentary participation and Yusuf's position) is flawed due to fundamental differences. Hence, the comparison is invalid — a **false analogy**.

Ibn al-Qayyim said in *Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn*:

> "Corrupt analogy is the root of every evil."

Al-Shāṭibī said in *al-Iʿtiṣām*:

> "False analogy leads to contradicting the Sharīʿah, turning what is ḥalāl into ḥarām and vice versa."

Therefore, this is a corrupt and invalid analogy.

---

3. Yusuf (peace be upon him) was fully empowered in the land. He ruled and commanded freely — none had authority over him, and he obeyed no one. Rather, others obeyed him.

Allah says:

> "**Indeed, today you are with us established and trusted.**" (Yusuf 12:54)

Scholars' explanation of "makīn" (established):

- **Imam al-Ṭabarī said in his Tafsīr:** "Having power over what I desired."
- **Al-Qurṭubī said in his Tafsīr:** "Possessing authority and decisive speech."
- **Al-Shawkānī said in his Tafsīr:** "The meaning of makīn (firmly established): a person of status and trust, such that he can carry out whatever he wants on behalf of the king."
- **Al-Rāzī said in his Tafsīr:** "So-and-so is makīn with so-and-so means he has status or position — a condition that enables the person to achieve what he wants."
- **And Ibn Manẓūr** mentioned something similar in Lisān al-ʿArab.

Thus, Yusuf had full authority over his duties and decisions. On this basis, the Prophet Yūsuf said to the king:

> "**Appoint me over the storehouses of the land.**" (Yusuf 12:55)

Thus, Prophet Yūsuf managed the storehouses according to what he saw fit and as he willed — whether it conformed to or opposed the king's laws. He governed the treasury based on the law of his Lord, not the law of the king. The evidence is in the verse:

> "**Thus We established Yusuf in the land, to settle therein wherever he willed.**" (Yusuf 12:56)

Statements of scholars in the interpretation of this verse:

- **Al-Baghawī** said: "Thus We established Yūsuf in the land — meaning the land of Egypt — We gave him authority over it; he would reside wherever he pleased and do in it whatever he wished."
- **Al-Ṭabarī**, quoting **al-Suddī**, said: "The king appointed him over Egypt; he was in charge of all its affairs — overseeing commerce, trade, and everything related to its administration."
- **ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Zayd**, as quoted by al-Ṭabarī, said: "We gave him authority over what was in it (the land) over whatever he wanted of that worldly domain. He could do as he pleased, and had he wanted to place Pharaoh beneath him and elevate himself over him, he could have done so."

Another proof of the authority and decisiveness of Prophet Yūsuf's command (peace be upon him):

An example of this is:

- **His returning the price of the grain to his brothers**, as Allah says:
  "**And he said [Yūsuf] to his servants: Put their merchandise into their saddlebags.**" [Yūsuf: 62]
  Here, Yūsuf (peace be upon him) is managing the revenue from sales. How does this action relate to his statement to the king: ***"I will indeed guard them with full knowledge"*** *(Yusuf 12:55)*
  when he returned the payment to his brothers? Where is the sense of **"safeguarding"** in that?
  The certainty lies in what the king said to him:
  "***Indeed, today you are with us established and trusted.***" (Yusuf 12:54)
  Meaning: he had full freedom of action.

- **Another proof is his conditional demand that his brothers bring their younger brother if they wanted to purchase grain again**:
  "Bring me a brother of yours from your father." [Yūsuf: 59]

  And he said:
  "But if you do not bring him to me, then there will be no measure [of grain] for you from me." [Yūsuf: 60]

  This condition was certainly not part of the king's religion or legal code — rather, it was a direct act of authority from Yūsuf (peace be upon him). This was the state of Prophet Yūsuf.

In contrast, parliamentarians today are strictly bound by ṭāghūt laws.

- They cannot contradict even the smallest clause of the man-made constitution.
- They cannot act freely in their ministries — their hands are tied.
- Every action must go through layers of bureaucracy and law.

The question is:
Does any one of them truly have freedom to act in his ministry? Is his command absolute, like Yusuf's was?
Absolutely not. This renders the analogy completely invalid.
As the scholars said:

> *"Analogies with clear distinctions are false."*
> **Al-Shāṭibī**: *"False analogy has no place in the religion."*

---

4. Yusuf (peace be upon him) ruled by Allah's law — not by the king's law (assuming the king was a disbeliever).

The story in summary:

- Yusuf took his brother and held him according to the law of **Yaʿqūb (Jacob)** — not the king's law.
- He arranged for the king's cup to be placed in his brother's bag, so he could detain him by the divine law — not the state's law.

Allah says:

> *"Thus did We plan for Yusuf. He could not have taken his brother under the king's law except that Allah willed. We raise in degrees whom We will."* (Yusuf 12:76)

Scholars' interpretation of this verse:

- **Al-Ṭabarī**: *"He could not have taken his brother under the king's law, because that law did not allow enslavement for theft."*
  - **Ibn ʿAbbās**, **al-Ḍaḥḥāk**: *"Under the king's authority."*
  - **Qatādah**: *"It was not the law of the king to enslave a thief."*
  - **Maʿmar**: *"The king's law required financial penalty, not enslavement."*
  - **Ibn Zayd**: *"The prophets' law (Jacob's) prescribed enslavement for theft."*

This was confirmed by other major commentators like **al-Qurṭubī** and **Ibn Kathīr**.

Response to the claims of democrats:

It is crystal clear that Yusuf (peace be upon him) ruled by **Allah's law**, not the king's law.

- He said:

> *"The rule is only for Allah. He has commanded that you worship none but Him."* (Yusuf 12:40)
> *"Are different lords better, or Allah, the One, the Subduer?"* (Yusuf 12:39)

These were his words **in prison**, establishing **tawḥīd and ḥākimiyyah (sovereignty) for Allah alone.**
Would he then emerge from prison to declare: **"The rule belongs to the ṭāghūt"**?!

- Could he contradict the very foundation of his daʿwah?!
- Their claim that he ruled by the king's law is **baseless** — there is no evidence for it.

Allah says:

> *"Indeed, We sent to every nation a messenger, saying: Worship Allah and avoid the ṭāghūt."* (Al-Naḥl 16:36)

The mission of **all prophets** was based on **two principles**:

1. **Worshiping Allah alone**
2. **Avoiding the ṭāghūt**

How could a prophet call people to avoid the ṭāghūt, and then himself become part of its regime?

- **Impossible!**
- To claim this is to accuse a prophet of violating his mission and falling into disbelief.

Conclusion:

- Did Yusuf ever swear allegiance to the constitution of the ṭāghūt? **Absolutely not!**
- Did he ever approve of laws contrary to Allah's law? **Never!**

This doubt is invalid from its very foundation. May Allah help us all.

Question to Shaykh Al-Albani:

Some brothers have raised an objection regarding the prohibition of entering parliaments, citing the example of Prophet Yusuf (peace be upon him and upon our Prophet), who was under the rule of a disbeliever. So, why is it not permissible for Muslims to enter such parliaments?

Shaykh Al-Albani's Answer: "Recently, we were speaking about elections and how they are not legislated (in Islam), and about some Islamic groups getting involved in parliaments that are based on ruling by other than what Allah has revealed. One of those sitting with us brought up a similar objection to yours, saying: 'Yusuf (peace be upon him) said: "Appoint me over the storehouses of the land. Indeed, I will be a knowing guardian"—so he was a ruler under the authority of a pagan ruler, Al-'Aziz. Why then is it impermissible for Muslims to enter these parliaments?'My response was from two angles or more. First, Yusuf (peace be upon him) did not reach that noble position through illegitimate elections. Rather, Allah, with His infinite wisdom, tested him with the wife of Al-'Aziz… and as a result of that, he was cast into prison. Among the events of his imprisonment was his encounter with the two prisoners. Eventually, one of them was executed, and the other became the king's cupbearer. As you know, the king saw a dream: "Indeed, I saw seven fat cows being eaten by seven lean ones..." etc.Then the one who survived and remembered Yusuf after a long time said: "I will inform you of its interpretation, so send me." He went to Yusuf and said: "O Yusuf, O man of truth, explain to us..."—and so on. He brought the interpretation back to the king, which impressed him. The king then said: "Bring him to me, so I may keep him exclusively for myself." Yusuf

then said: “Appoint me over the storehouses of the land. Indeed, I will be a knowing guardian.”So Yusuf (peace be upon him) did not take any path to reach that high position. It was never even on his mind. Rather, Allah decreed all those events, with their various forms, until the king himself chose him and made him a minister over his state. He then ruled by the revelation from his Lord, not by the laws of the disbeliever.That’s one angle. As for us today, we are knocking on pagan, idolatrous, and polytheistic doors—God forbid that such doors would even cross the mind of Yusuf (peace be upon him), let alone that he would practically pursue them.Elections today are aligned with the systems of the disbelievers, systems in which there is no distinction between believer and disbeliever—people are all equal in their eyes… and in the end, it is usually the most wicked among people who are elected.So this path, this disbelieving route, is not suitable for us. To then use the story of Yusuf (peace be upon him) as proof for it? There is a huge difference between the two—between that story and the current reality of elections." [From: Silsilat al-Huda wa al-Nur – Tape no. 668 – Timestamp: 00:06:13]

Doubt: Al-Najashi and His Ruling by Other Than What Allah Revealed

the Doubt:

Some individuals who claim to follow Islam yet adopt democracy cite the story of **Al-Najashi**, saying:

> *"Al-Najashi accepted Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet ﷺ, yet he continued to rule Abyssinia just as he had before his conversion — that is, according to Christian laws or the traditions of his people. The Prophet ﷺ did not demand that he change this, but rather approved of him and even prayed the funeral prayer in absentia for him when he dead. Therefore, it is permissible today for a Muslim to participate in parliaments and rule by other than the law of Allah, just as Al-Najashi did.* ***they claim****"*

So, what is the reality of this argument? Is it valid? Did Al-Najashi knowingly rule by other than what Allah revealed? When did he accept Islam? And did all of Islamic legislation reach him? We will answer these questions below, with the help of Allah I say.

First: When Did Al-Najashi Embrace Islam?

- **Al-Najashi** name *Aṣḥamah ibn Abjar*, the king of Abyssinia (al-Ḥabasha).
- It is said that he embraced Islam around the **6th year after Hijrah**, likely after the debate between **Jaʿfar ibn Abī Ṭālib** and **ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ** (before his conversion), a discussion which mentiond by **Ibn Kathīr** in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (Vol. 4, pp. 180–185).
- Others say he accepted Islam after the Prophet ﷺ sent **ʿAmr ibn Umayyah al-Ḍamrī** with a letter inviting him to Islam.
- However, the more accurate account is that **he became Muslim before receiving the letter**, because Al-Najashi mentioned in his reply to the Prophet ﷺ that he had already accepted Islam at the hands of **Jaʿfar ibn Abī Ṭālib**, the Prophet's cousin.
- It is recorded in ***Usud al-Ghābah*** **by Ibn al-Athīr (1/62)** and others that Al-Najashi responded to the Prophet ﷺ with a message saying:

> *"In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Compassionate. Peace be upon you, O Prophet of Allah, and the mercy and blessings of Allah — the One besides whom there is no deity, who guided me to Islam… We have understood what you were sent to us with, and we have welcomed your cousin and his companions. I testify that you are truly the Messenger of Allah, and that you are honest and trustworthy. I have pledged allegiance to you and to your cousin, and I have embraced Islam at his hands, for the sake of Allah, Lord of the worlds."*

- Regarding his death, **Ibn Kathīr** said in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah (4/523)*:

> *"Apparently, the death of Al-Najashi occurred well before the Conquest of Makkah."*

- And it is known that Makkah was conquered in the **8th year after Hijrah**. Since Al-Najashi died before that, and his conversion was around the **6th year**, then his period as a Muslim lasted **between the 6th and 8th years of Hijrah**.
- He is considered among the **tābiʿīn (followers)** because he never saw the Prophet ﷺ in person.

Secondly: Did al-Najashi rule by other than what Allah revealed knowingly? And did the complete Islamic legislation reach him?

The answer: No, he did not rule contrary to what Allah revealed out of knowledge, nor had the complete legislation reached him.

Al-Najashi acted upon what he knew of Islam. He believed in Allah, in the prophethood of Muhammad ﷺ, abandoned the Christian belief that 'Isa is the son of God, and believed instead that he is a servant and messenger of Allah.

However:

- **The detailed rulings of Islamic law regarding judgment, governance, and other matters had not reached him.** And this matter is not exclusive to al-Najashi; the Companions who migrated to Abyssinia were in the same situation as him. They left Makkah with only the limited knowledge of Islam they had at the time. Their migration to Abyssinia was **in the fifth year of the Prophetic mission, and they remained there until the seventh year after the Hijrah**.

They returned to Madinah in the year of the Battle of Khaybar. That means they spent nearly 13 years in Abyssinia, during which they were unaware of the legislations that were revealed in Madinah. They only had knowledge of the religion **from the Makkan period.**

- **Al-Najashi lived in a distant land far from Madinah.** The routes between Abyssinia and Madinah were cut off, and so he was excused in his ignorance of many of the rulings. It is well known that legal rulings only become binding after knowledge of them has reached a person.

Evidence that the rulings had not reached them:

- **The hadith of Abdullah ibn Mas'ud** (may Allah be pleased with him), when he returned from Abyssinia and greeted **the Prophet ﷺ,** but the Prophet did not respond. He said: *"O Messenger of Allah, we used to greet you with salam and you would return it to us,"* to which the Prophet ﷺ replied: *"Verily, in prayer there is enough preoccupation"* (**Agreed upon**). This indicates that the ruling about not speaking during prayer had been abrogated but had not yet reached them.
- Likewise, when al-Najashi died, the Prophet ﷺ performed the funeral prayer for him, knowing that al-Najashi and the Muslims with him had no knowledge of the proper funeral rites.

Ibn al-'Arabi al-Maliki mentioned:

> "What I believe about the Prophet's ﷺ prayer [for al-Najashi] is that he knew **al-Najashi and those who believed with him had no knowledge of the Sunnah regarding the funeral prayer**. He knew they would bury him without it, so he hastened to offer it."
> (*al-Qabas fi Sharh Muwatta' Malik*, p. 446)

Ibn Kathir commented on Ibn al-'Arabi's statement, saying:

> *"This is a good answer."*

It is narrated in the **two Sahihs that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said** on the day al-Najashi died:

> *"Today, a righteous man has died. Stand and pray the funeral prayer for your brother Ashamah."* (**Agreed upon**)

- **Benefit:** Whoever has not received the message of the Sharia is not to be declared a disbeliever due to their ignorance. One of the established barriers to takfīr is that if a person embraces Islam but lives in a remote desert or a far-off area disconnected from the Muslim community, then he is excused — because Islamic rulings are not binding except after knowledge of them has reached a person. This is a firmly established principle in Islam, upon which the scholars are agreed.

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> "The foundation of all this is: Are the rulings of the Sharia binding on one who has not learned them, or are they only binding after knowledge has reached him?... **The fundamental view of the Salaf and the majority** is that Allah does not burden a soul beyond its capacity. Obligation is conditional upon ability, and punishment is only for abandoning a required duty or committing a forbidden act after the proof has been established."
> [Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 19/228]

Ibn Ḥazm said:

> "Whoever has not received knowledge of a particular obligation of the religion is excused and there is no blame upon him. **Jaʿfar ibn Abī Ṭālib and his companions, may Allah be pleased with them, were in Abyssinia while the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was in Madinah, the Qur'an was being revealed, and new rulings were being legislated — but none of this reached Jaʿfar and his companions due to the complete severance of the route between Madinah and Abyssinia.** This continued for six years. Yet this caused them no harm in their religion, as they practiced what had been forbidden and avoided what had been made obligatory."
> [al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wa-l-Ahwāʾ wa-l-Niḥal 4/50]

He also said:

> "There is no disagreement **that if a man were to accept Islam without knowing the laws of Islam, and he believed that alcohol was permissible, or that there is no prayer upon him — and this is because Allah's rulings had not reached him** — then he would not be considered a kafir. This is by unanimous agreement (of valid scholarly views)." [al-Muḥallā bi-l-Āthār 12/135]

Ibn Taymiyyah and **Ibn al-Qayyim** also mentioned that al-Najāshī concealed his faith out of fear of his people, just like the believer from the family of Pharaoh.
Ibn Taymiyyah said:

> "Likewise the disbelievers: if one of them receives the message of the Prophet ﷺ while in the land of disbelief, and he comes to know that he is the Messenger of Allah, believes in him, and fears Allah as much as he can — l**ike al-Najāshī and others did** — and he is unable to emigrate to the land of Islam or implement all the rulings of Islam **because he is prevented from emigrating and from openly practicing his faith,** and there **is no one to teach him all the rulings: then such a person is a believer and among the people of Paradise** — just like the believer from Pharaoh's household and the wife of Pharaoh." [Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 19/217]

From all of this, we understand that **al-Najāshī – may Allah have mercy on him – is not to be declared a Kafir**, despite the fact that he did not rule by the entirety of Allah's law. The reason is that he implemented what had reached him from the religion, while communication between him and the Prophet ﷺ and the Muslims was cut off, and thus many rulings never reached him.
As for **those who today permit entering elections or participating in parliaments under ṭāghūt systems**, they are not excused — because the proof of Allah has been established upon them. The Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Prophet ﷺ have reached them, and within them the rulings and legislation are complete and clear. There is no excuse for anyone to be ignorant of them in this time when knowledge is widespread and means of access are readily available.
Allah the Most High said:

> **"**Say, 'What thing is greatest in testimony?' Say, 'Allah is Witness between me and you. **And this Qur'an was revealed to me that I may warn you with it and whomever it reaches."** [Surah al-Anʿām: 19]

Third: Is al-Najāshī a justification for those who rule by man-made laws today?

The answer: No — and what a vast difference there is between al-Najāshī and such people.

Key differences:

- **Al-Najāshī entered Islam and left his former religion,** whereas those who use him as evidence have abandoned Islam and entered into the constitutions of the ṭāghūt.
- **Al-Najāshī did not receive the full legislation of Islam,** while those involved in democratic systems have access to the complete religion of Allah — some of whom even have in-depth knowledge of its rulings, and some who teach them.
- **Al-Najāshī concealed his faith because he was under compulsion** and feared being killed if he declared his religion, whereas these individuals **freely choose** to participate in legislative elections and enter parliaments of their own will, without any compulsion.

Conclusion:

- Al-Najāshī was a Mu'min Muwahhid. He did not knowingly rule by other than what Allah had revealed; rather, **the details of the Sharia had not reached him**, and he was excused.
- The inference made by those who participate in parliaments and ṭāghūt systems by citing the story of al-Najāshī is a **false analogy,** because in reality, **they have abandoned Islam knowingly and by choice** — not due to a lack of access to the message of islam or because of coercion.
- **It is invalid to compare someone who concealed his faith due to a valid excuse and acted upon what had reached him,** to someone who **knowingly chooses the Kufr** and rejects what has reached him of Allah's religion.

Doubt: Du'a of the Sahabah for al-Najashi (while he was a kafir) for victory over his enemy

They claim that the Companions who were in Al-Habasha made Du'a for al-Najashi's victory over his enemy — while, according to their assertion, al-Najashi was still a Kafir at the time. Based on this, they argue: "It is permissible for us today to participate in elections and vote for a Kafir who is less harmful to us than another!"

I truly do not see any similarity or connection between the two situations!

This doubt, like many others, is **false from every angle**. It is often cited by those who advocate for participating in elections. But no problem — let us read the full story and see where the evidence lies.

Ibn Kathir narrated:

> **Umm Salamah said:** "We lived with the best neighbor in the best land. But soon after, a man from Abyssinia rose against al-Najashi to challenge him for his kingdom. By Allah, we had never felt a sorrow more intense than our fear that this man might defeat al-Najashi and a king would come who didn't know our rights as he did. **So we began praying to Allah and seeking His help for al-Najashi.** Then al-Najashi set out to confront the man. The Companions of the Prophet ﷺ said to one another: 'Who will go and witness the outcome of the battle?'
>
> **Al-Zubayr**, who was one of the youngest among us, said: 'I will.' So they inflated a water skin for him, which he used as a float on his chest and swam across the Nile until he reached the battlefield. He witnessed the battle, in which Allah defeated the opposing king and killed him. Al-Najashi was victorious.
>
> **Al-Zubayr** came back waving his garment and shouting: 'Rejoice! Allah has granted al-Najashi victory!'
>
> I swear, we had never been happier than we were at that news. We remained there with al-Najashi until some of us returned to Makkah, while others stayed."
>
> — [Ibn Kathir, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 3/293]

As is their habit, they abandon the **clear, definitive evidences from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah** of His Messenger ﷺ regarding the Kufr of those who legislate apart from Allah, and instead cling to an ambiguous incident from the Seerah that lacks even the **slightest proof that Al-Najashi was a Kafir when they made Du'a for his victory**. Let alone that the report does **not support the permissibility of dedicating acts of worship** — such as legislation — to other than Allah!

As usual, these people ignore the **clear and definitive evidences** from the Qur'an and Sunnah that declare as **disbelievers those who legislate other than what Allah has revealed**, and they cling instead to an ambiguous historical incident from the Prophet's biography that **lacks any indication** that al-Najashi was a disbeliever when the Companions prayed for his victory.

Let alone that the report does **not support the permissibility of dedicating acts of worship** — such as legislation — to other than Allah!

Allah says:

> **"**It is He who has sent down to you the Book. In it are verses that are precise — they are the foundation of the Book — and others unspecific. As for those in whose hearts is deviation, they will follow that of it which is unspecific, seeking discord and seeking an interpretation for it...**"** — **[Āl ʿImrān 3:7]**

So the principle is: the **ambiguous is to be interpreted in light of the clear** — not the other way around. Especially in a matter like this, where we have so many definitive proofs.

Ibn al-Qayyim said:

> "The method of the Companions, the Tābiʿīn, and the leading scholars of hadith — like **al-Shāfiʿī, Imām Aḥmad, Mālik, Abū Ḥanīfah, Abū Yūsuf, al-Bukhārī, and Isḥāq** — was to refer the ambiguous to the clear, and to derive from the clear what would explain the ambiguous and clarify its meaning. This way, the meaning of both aligns, and the texts support and confirm one another. All of them are from Allah, and what is from Allah contains no contradiction or disagreement. Contradiction and inconsistency only come from sources other than Him."
> — [*Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn*, 2/209]

Now we ask: Where in this story does it indicate that al-Najashi was a Kafir when the Companions made Du'a for his victory?

> **"Say: Bring your proof, if you are truthful." — [Al-Baqarah 2:111]**

You must provide **definitive proof** that al-Najashi was not a Muslim at the time.

On the contrary, what is established is that al-Najashi accepted Islam shortly **after the Companions migrated** to Abyssinia, as mentioned earlier when refuting the previous claim.

Al-Najashi accepted Islam **before** the Prophet's letter reached him in the sixth year of the Prophetic mission. The migration to Abyssinia occurred in **Rajab of the fifth year**, meaning his conversion came just **months later**, likely after the **famous debate between Jaʿfar ibn Abī Ṭālib and ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ**.

Evidence:

It was reported by **Ibn Masʿūd** (may Allah be pleased with him):

> **ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ said**: "They contradict you concerning ʿĪsā ibn Maryam!"
> **[The king asked]** "What do you say about ʿĪsā and his mother?"
> **They replied:** "We say what Allah says: he is the Word of Allah and His Spirit, cast into the chaste virgin who was never touched by a man nor bore a child illegitimately."
> **The king then picked up a stick and said:**
> "O people of Abyssinia, priests, and monks! By Allah, what they say does not differ from what we believe by more than this twig! Welcome to you and to the one from whom you have come. **I bear witness that he is the Messenger of Allah — the one we find mentioned in the Bible, and the one ʿĪsā foretold.** Stay wherever you like. By Allah, were it not for my position as king, I would go to him myself and carry his sandals and perform his ablution." — [Musnad Aḥmad, 4/245]

Based on this, it is **very likely** that al-Najashi was already a **Muslim when the Companions made Duʿa for his victory**. And **Allah knows best**.

Even if we were to suppose — for the sake of argument — that he was not yet Muslim at that time, still, **nothing in the story indicates that the Companions dedicated an act of worship to other than Allah**.

Their **Duʿa for his victory** was **a supplication to Allah**, not a form of worship directed at al-Najashi — and it is in no way comparable to those who **dedicate legislative authority** to other than Allah through things like the democracy elections.

Even if Muslims **hoped for or rejoiced at the victory of one disbelieving group over another that was more hostile**, that is not considered shirk or forbidden allegiance (muwālāt). An example is how the **Companions rejoiced when the Romans defeated the Persians.**

It was narrated **in the Musnad of Imam Ahmad:**

> From **Ibn ʿAbbās** regarding the verse: **"Alif-Lām-Mīm. The Romans have been defeated…" [Al-Rum 30:1]— He said:** "They were defeated and then they were victorious. The polytheists preferred the victory of the Persians because they were pagans, **while the Muslims preferred the victory of the Romans because they were People of the Book**. Then the Romans eventually prevailed, and that is the meaning of the verse:
> **'On that day the believers will rejoice at the victory of Allah.'"**
> — [Musnad Aḥmad, 4/296]

Conclusion:

All the arguments presented by these groups **follow this same weak and shaky pattern**. What they call "evidence" does not even deserve to be called that — it's all based on **faulty reasoning**, with no reliance on any **definitive, clear text** permitting them to dedicate acts of worship — like legislation — to other than Allah.
Meanwhile, the **clear-cut evidence** for the **Kufr of anyone who sets up partners with Allah in legislation and judgment** is **abundant and overwhelming**.
And Allah is the One whose help is sought.

A Final Advice:

In the end, I can only advise myself and my fellow Muslims to fear Allah. Fear Allah concerning your religion, my brothers and sisters! Beware lest you sacrifice your Hereafter for the sake of your worldly life. If any of you has not yet become fully convinced of the kufr inherent in democratic (legislative) elections—even after reading all the evidences regarding the disbelief of both voters and candidates—and if the matter remains unclear to you due to a passing doubt or a statement by a certain "scholar", then it is safer and more prudent in such serious matters to abstain. Do not gamble with your religion, for this is a grave matter: **it is a matter of faith or Kufr**, Paradise or Hell.

I remind you of what has been reported from the **Messenger of Allah** ﷺ:
"Leave what makes you doubt for what does not make you doubt."
[Reported by al-Tirmidhi (2518) and Ahmad (1723)]

And from **al-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr** (may Allah be pleased with him), who said:
I heard the **Messenger of Allah** ﷺ **say:**
"Indeed, the lawful is clear, and the unlawful is clear, and between them are matters that are doubtful, which many people do not know. So whoever avoids the doubtful matters has protected his religion and his honor, and whoever falls into the doubtful has fallen into the unlawful." [**Agreed upon**]

Likewise, there is another proof from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ when there was uncertainty regarding the permissibility or prohibition of hunting; in such a case, refraining (from it) was given precedence as a precaution.
From ʿAdī ibn Ḥātim (may Allah be pleased with him), who said:
I said, "O Messenger of Allah, I send off my dog and I mention the name of Allah."
The Prophet ﷺ **said:** "If you send off your dog and mention Allah's name, and it catches and kills (the prey), and eats from it—then do not eat it, for it has caught it for itself."
I said, "I send my dog, and then I find another dog with it, and I don't know which one caught it."
He said: **"Then do not eat it, for you mentioned Allah's name on your dog but not on the other..."** [Reported by al-Bukhārī]

And in another narration:
"If you find that it has killed (the prey) but not eaten from it, then you may eat it. **But if you find another dog with your dog, and the prey is killed, then do not eat it, for you do not know which of the two killed it."**
[**Agreed upon**]

The point here: When there is doubt about whether the condition that permits something has been fulfilled, the original ruling of prohibition remains, and abstention becomes obligatory.

And I say: how much more important it is to apply this principle to greater matters—**especially in the issues of *shirk* and *tawḥīd***. So if doubt arises in such issues—whether something **constitutes Kufr or not—then the safer course is abstention**.

And I only say this if you *still* have doubts, dear reader. But I ask Allah, after all this clarification, that no doubt remains in your heart, by His permission.

Lastly, my brothers and sisters: **do not blindly follow any shaykh or scholar in matters of your religion. Rather, follow the evidence wherever it leads.**

As was narrated from ʿ**Ikrimah, from Ibn ʿAbbās** (may Allah be pleased with them both): **"There is no one whose opinion may be fully accepted and fully rejected except the Prophet ﷺ."**

[Al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr by al-Ṭabarānī, 11/339]

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

Mālik said: **"Indeed, I am only a human being. I may be right or wrong, so weigh my statements against the Qur'an and Sunnah."**

Abū Ḥanīfah said: **"This is my opinion. If someone brings a better opinion, we will accept it."**

Al-Shāfiʿī said: "**If a ḥadīth is authentic, then throw my opinion against the wall.**"

And he also said: "**If you see the proof placed clearly on the path, then I say as it says.**"

Imām Aḥmad said: "**Do not take your religion from men, for they are not immune from error.**"

[Al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā by Ibn Taymiyyah, 6/339]

Imām Aḥmad said: "Do not blindly follow me, nor Mālik, nor al-Thawrī, nor al-Awzāʿī. Rather, take from where they took." And he also said: "From the weakness of a man's understanding **is that he blindly follow men in his religion."** [Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn 3/469]

Allah knows best.

And our final supplication is: All praise is due to Allah, Lord of the worlds.